

To: Cope, Ben[Cope.Ben@epa.gov]; Owens, Kim[Owens.Kim@epa.gov]
From: Rueda, Helen
Sent: Mon 7/29/2013 6:36:11 PM
Subject: RE: CFA62 rationale in 10 steps...make that 9

Oops I sent my comments before I noticed Ben's. I leave it to you Ben, to review and decide which of my suggestions to go with. I did fill in the blanks.

From: Cope, Ben
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 4:37 PM
To: Owens, Kim; Rueda, Helen
Subject: CFA62 rationale in 10 steps...make that 9

Kim, Helen –

My attempts to address Kim's comments. You'll be happy to hear it's down to 9 steps.

Helen, I can't track down your analysis in my files (I know it's here somewhere!)...can you fill in the X and Y in #9?

Attaching Breithapt (2008) and PNNL/City Light presentation since they are referenced.

Who sends to HQ? Maybe run it by Jim first, Kim?

Cheers. –BC

From: Owens, Kim
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2013 10:17 AM
To: Cope, Ben; Rueda, Helen

Subject: RE: CFA62 rationale in 10 steps

In response to your voicemail – I'm delighted! This is the most concise articulation yet. See a few comments targeted at anticipated questions back.

From: Cope, Ben
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 8:10 AM
To: Rueda, Helen; Owens, Kim
Subject: CFA62 rationale in 10 steps

Kim -

Kim, see attached for the kind of detailed rationale that Jim seems to be seeking. Much of this is old stuff, but I think it's more clear/definitive on some key points. Helen and I have gone back and forth on it once, so now it's time to get your read on it.

Helen, thanks for the excellent edits in the first round.

Also, Kim, if this is not new enough material to make a difference, please tell me/us. Don't want to waste time/effort.

-BC